



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

military dictionaries even in our century; its title runs as follows: *The Gentleman's Dictionary in three parts. I, The Art of Riding the great Horse, etc. . . . II, The Military Art, etc. . . . III, The Art of Navigation, etc. . . . Each part done alphabetically from the sixteenth edition of the original French, published by the Sieur Guillet, and dedicated to the Dauphin. With large additions, alterations and improvements, adapted to the customs and actions of the English, and above forty curious cuts, that were not in the original. London 1705.*

From the Publisher's Preface we see that the English terms given in the dictionary are thoroughly reliable and not mere imitations of French words: "In translating this part (the first), we have taken care to do justice to the French, and at the same time to bring it as near to our Jockey Terms, as the nature of the thing would allow." In the following list are not included such words as are purely French in form, although some of them no doubt might have been given:

abate (1721), action,¹⁰ advance fosse,¹⁰ afterward (1867), air,¹⁰ alarm post (1721), anspesade (1751), antestature (1706), apron (1719), appointe (1727), arm (1751), armed,¹⁰ arzel,¹⁰ assembly (1727), aubin (1751), bacule,¹⁰ balotade (1727), bandeleer,¹⁰ banquet (1753), bar (1753), barbe,¹⁰ barepump,¹⁰ barm (1729), barque-longue,¹⁰ battery master,¹⁰ bean,¹⁰ beat (1753), biovac (1706), bleyne,¹⁰ blossom,¹⁰ boar (1731), bouillon,¹⁰ bout,¹⁰ boyau (1847), branch (1838), brassi-court,¹⁰ braye,¹⁰ breast,¹⁰ breastplate (1720), breed,¹⁰ bridge,¹⁰ brigade major (1810), brillant (1731), bring in (1753), cadence (Bailey), calade (1731), capesquare,¹⁰ capital (1706), carry low,¹⁰ carry well (1829), cavin (1708), chack (1731), chaufrin (1730), channel (1753), chapelet (1753), chaperon,¹⁰ chevalier (1753), chevette (1731), claponnier (1731), claye (1708), clift,¹⁰ close,¹⁰ coffer (1727), coffin bone (1720), complement (1708), conductor (1778), cork,¹⁰ cornet (incorrectly treated); couched,¹⁰ countermarked (1727), counterpoise (1727), crack,¹⁰ creat (1730), cric (1874?), croat,¹⁰ cross,¹⁰ crowned,¹⁰ croupade (1849), curb (a tumour),¹⁰ deceive,¹⁰ demigorge (1706), ebrillade (1753), ecaves-sade,¹⁰ echarpe (1772), effect,¹⁰ embrace,¹⁰ empatement,¹⁰ enciente (1708), encraïne (1731),

enfilade (1706), enlarge (1753), entrepas,¹⁰ envelope (1707), ergot (Syd. Soc. Lex.), estrapade (1730), extend,¹⁰ face of a place (1727), face of a gun (1727), falcade (1730), fanion (1706).

It is to be sorely regretted that the *Oxford Dictionary* does not incorporate the results of a thorough study of the old dictionaries, cyclopedias and word books.

LEO WIENER.

Cambridge, Mass.

FINAL -s IN GERMANIC.

THE theory, revived by Hirt, PBB., xviii, 527ff., that in West Germ. final -s as well as -z fell away, seems to be gaining ground. This view is favorably received by Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, §214. This I consider unproved and improbable.

The state of the case, as it seems to me, is this: Final -s very often became -z by analogy, but never through phonetic change. A -z thus arising disappeared in W. G. the same as an original Germ. -z.

We know that in o-stems in Germ. the nom. sing. should, according to accent, end in -az or -as. As a matter of fact we have no evidence that the nom. sing. ever ended in -as. In O.N. the ending is uniformly -r or its equivalent, and that, too, where we know the final -s was preceded by an accent, as in the preterit participle. Even iā-stems in O.N. assumed r in the nom. sing., as *heidr*. That the same generalization took place in all the W.G. dialects cannot be affirmed positively—unless it is proved that final -s remained—but it is highly probable. It is at least more reasonable to assume such a generalization than to set up a separate phonetic law to account for the disappearance of final -s.

In the nom. plur. there was a singular generalization in O.N. In the W. G. dialects there is variation. This variation is more easily explained by supposing that final -s remains, while final -z falls away, than to assume that final -s also fell away. O.H.G. *tagā*, then, corresponds to O.N. *dagar*, Goth. *dagōs*, as all agree; while O.S. *dagos*, O.E. *dagas* may well represent a Germ. ending -ōs, with-

¹⁰ Not given in Murray.

out resorting to a comparison with the Skt. *dēvāsas*. And why not regard the O.Frs. ending *-ar* as in *fiskar*, *bûrar* as transferred from the neuter *es*-stems? This indeed is the explanation of Siebs, *Paul's Grundriss*, i, p. 762, though he confines it to the dialect of Wangeroo.

The question naturally arises: Why did not a nom. plur. fem. ending *-ōs* develop in the same way? Why not O.S. **gebos*? For as Hirt, PBB., xviii, 525, thinks, there were more *ā*- than *o*- stems with accented ultima. This is not a matter to be decided by counting. The form that gains the ascendancy in a dialect does not necessarily represent the majority. If it did, we should be forced to many strange conclusions. On the supposition that O. Frs. *fiskar* shows an ending *-ōses*, O.S. *dagos* an ending *-ōses*, and O.H.G. *tagā* the ending *-ōz* or *-ōs*, we should be driven to an absurdity by a majority rule. For reasons not always easily accounted for, each dialect went its own way and made its own choice. A form like O.H.G. *zwō*, therefore, does not prove that an *-s* has fallen away, since we may suppose that an original *twōs* first became by analogy **twōz*, and then *zwō*. Otherwise, what shall we say about O.N. *tueir*, *þeir*? Here if anywhere, as Hirt, PBB., xviii, 527, remarks of Goth. *twōs*, O.H.G. *zwō*, the *s* should have remained surd. But it did not in O.N. More than that, the *r* was added to forms where it did not belong originally, as *tueir*, *þeir*, Goth. *twai*, *pai*.

From Goth. *panzei*, *hwanzuh* we should infer that in *o*-stems the acc. plur. ended in *-anz* and not *-ans*. There is evidence for this also in the other dialects. Many see in O.H.G. acc. plur. *taga*, O.S. *daga* the representative of Goth. *dagans*, on the supposition that in N. and W.G. final *-us* (*-nz*) fell away. So Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, p. 231. This accounts for forms that otherwise cause difficulty. But it is easier to assume the disappearance of final *-nz* than of *-us*. For if *-us* disappeared, it leaves such forms as *uns*, *gans* to be explained. If, however, final *-nz* fell off, it must have been at an early period—at least before the syncope of *i* or *a* in the third syllable. For while, according to this theory, Goth. *dagans* is the same as O.H.G. *taga*;

Goth. *hanins* < **haniniz*, *gripans* < **gripanaz* are in O.H.G. *hanen*, *grifan*. From O.N. *hana* but *gripenn* it would seem that syncope took place earlier in **hananiz* than in **gripanaz*, unless with Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, p. 255, footnote, we suppose that in the latter word the nom. sing. has been re-formed from the oblique cases.

In whatever way taken the theory of the disappearance of final *-nz* has its difficulties. I therefore propose this formulation of it: (1) In N. and G.W. final *-z* when preceded by *n* fell off. This occurred at an early period, but later than the change of the acc. sing. **dagam* to **dagan*. The acc. plur. **daganz* > **dagan*, we may suppose, about the time that the acc. sing. had reached the stage **daga*. Later the acc. plur. **dagan*, **sunun*, etc., became O.N. *daga*, *sunu*, O.H.G. *taga*, **sunu* (cf. *situ*), O.E. *sunu*. (2) After this change had taken place, final *-z* again came in contact with *n* in the gen. sing. of *n*-stems, when **hananiz*, **haniniz* > **hanan*, **hanin*. This stage is seen in Runic *þrawngan* and in the Finnish loanword *maanantai*. As final *-n* in O.N. disappears, the gen. sing. became *hana*. In W.G. the final *-n* of the gen. sing. *hanan*, *hanen* remained. In this second period, therefore, the *-n* in W.G. was protected until after the first period, when the *-n* was subject to decay. (3) Unless we explain the pret. part. with Streitberg as above, we must set up a third period for O.N. on account of Runic *haitinaR* > O.N. *heitenn*. But if these forms are to be judged as *steinn* < *stainaR*, *skinn* < *skinaR*, then the syncope occurred at a time when *R* < *z* was assimilable to *n*.

In the other stems the ending of the gen. sing. makes less noticeable the difference in the nom. plur., where O.S. *dagos*, O.E. *dagas* appear strange by the side of the plur. fem. *geba*, *giefā*. Now we find that the ending of the gen. sing. in N. and W.G. is *-s* in *o*-stems and in nouns modeled thereafter, but in *ā*-stems and, for the most part, in other stems it is *-r* in O.N., with the corresponding ending in W.G. So the surprise at the difference in the development of the nom. plur. of *o*- and *ā*-stems in O.S. and O.E. need not be so great when we see there is a corresponding difference in the gen. sing. It may be that more

ā- than *o-*stems had an accented ultima; but the invariable *-r* in the gen. sing. of O.N. *ā-*stems together with the constant *-s* of *o-*stems does not point that way. And since N. and W.G. agree so well in the gen. ending, we may conclude that G.W. had **dages* but **gebōz* corresponding to O.N. *dags* and *gíafar*.

The ending of the second sing. of the verb was either *-z* or *-s* in Germ. It would properly be *-z* in the pres. ind. and opt. of thematic verbs of the normal type, and *-s* in aorist-presents, in weak verbs, in many athematic verbs, and in the pret. opt. The several dialects have generalized in different ways, or have made use of both endings. In Goth. there is positive evidence only for *-z*. In O.N. *-r* became the normal ending in all verbs, though *-s* is found in some earlier forms. In W.G. there was originally *-s* and *-z*, but, of course, not distributed in the way they are found in the monuments. It is quite probable that the *-s* of the second sing. in W.G. spread from a comparatively few forms where it remained after most of the verbs had generalized *-z*. This would naturally happen when *-z* fell away, for then there would remain no second sing. ending but *-s*. In this restoration the *-s* attached itself first to the pres. ind. of those verbs that had not retained it. Next it went to the pres. opt., though not in all dialects. The pret. opt. naturally followed. In O.E. the *-s* was confined to the pres. ind. of strong verbs and the pres. and pret. ind. of weak verbs. In the other W.G. dialects the *-s* occurs in all second sing. forms except the pret. ind. of strong verbs. Here it was not necessary to add the *-s* to distinguish the second sing. from the other forms. Now the fact that O.H.G. has *-t* in the third sing. is of no weight in judging of this matter: for generalizations are not always consistent. So while the *-ð* of O.S. *bindið*, O.E. *bindeð* and of O.S., O.E. *bindað* is evidence for the originality of the *-s* of O.S. *bindis*, O.E. *bindes*; the *-t* of O.H.G. *bin̄tit* is not evidence that the *-s* in *bin̄tis* is not original. That is, the *-s* of the second sing. in W.G. arose from *-ési* just as certainly as the *-ð* of the third sing. in O.S. and O.E. started from verbs accented *-éti*.

Moreover this *-s* cannot be regarded as an

assimilation from *-z* due to the appended pronoun *þu*, as some, following Paul, PBB. vi, 549, suppose. For if Germ. *z* > O.H.G. *s* > *t*, certainly *zd* would yield *st*, since *d* > *t*. This is what actually took place in passing from I.E. to Germ. Here may be mentioned Goth. *asts*, O.H.G. *geist*, *gersta*, *mast*, *nest*, in which *st* comes from I.E. *zd*. But Goth., Germ. *zd* always gives O.H.G. *rt*, O.E. *rd*. So Goth. *razda*, O.H.G. *rarla*, O.E. *reord*; O.H.G. *brort*, O.E. *brord*, with which is to be compared O.Ch. Slav. *brazda*; Goth. *mizdō*, O.E. *meord*.¹ Germ. *zd* developed thus in O.H.G. because *z* became *r* long before *d* became *t*. If then the pronoun *þu* had been joined often enough to the verb to cause the final *-z* to be treated as medial, it would have given rise in W.G. to a second sing. ending in *-r*, the *-r* remaining as in *er*, *wir*, *ur*-, etc. And those holding the assimilation *-z-þu* > *-s-t* can not go back to the I.E. *-s-tu*; for certainly the contact was no closer here than in compounds of *ur*-, and besides, as the derivation of *thousand* < **tūs-km̄tō-z* shows, I.E. *s* + *tenuis*, when brought together in a compound, were not protected from change as in a simple word.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Chicago.

THE HISTORY OF A VULGARISM.

THERE survives in America as a vulgarism a sound which two centuries ago was a common pronunciation. This pronunciation is not confined to any one district as the South or the North, but may be heard anywhere throughout the country, in the mouths of the unlettered. The pronunciation referred to is the vulgar sound of *oi* in such words as *appoint*, *poison*, *join*, *toil*, *spoil*, *coil*, *boil*, etc., where the diphthong is pronounced so as to rime with long *i*. Now, in the seventeenth century this was an accredited pronunciation as we are informed by the orthoepists of that century, and this information is confirmed by an examination of the rimes of the poets of that period among whom the more prominent are

¹ Brugmann, *Grundriss* i, §596.

² Brugmann, ii, 2, §180.